

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 17-23 were pending and all of the claims were rejected in the Office action. Claims 17 and 22-23 have been amended. The specification has been amended to update and correct the reference to the parent application. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 17-23 are pending after entry of this amendment.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 22 and 23 have been amended to delete the word "transparent". This overcomes the basis for the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Akins et al. (US 6,285,425; "Akins").

Claim 17 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*: [a] liquid crystal display device comprising a reflector having a plurality of light reflective portions arranged randomly adjacent to each other on a surface of a base material.

Support for this amendment is found, for example, at page 9, lines 21-22.

On the other hand, Akins teaches a liquid crystal device comprising a series of ridges oriented in a regular manner, such as in a stripe pattern with respect to each other (Id., for example, Figs. 3 or 5). Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the reference does not teach all of the elements of Claim 17, and specifically at least the element recited above. Consequently, amended Claim 17 is not anticipated by the reference and is thus allowable. Claims 18-23, are dependent on Claim 17, and, without more, are allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (US 6130736) in view of Akins, and Claims 17, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Akins.

With respect to Claims 17-21, the Examiner acknowledges that Sasaki cannot be used to teach aspects of the reflector. Nor, as previously asserted, does Akins teach the element in which light reflective portions are arranged randomly. Accordingly, since the combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 17, the claim is allowable. Claims 18-21, being dependent on Claim 17 are, without more, allowable.

With respect to Claims 17, 22 and 23, as discussed above, Akins does not teach all of the elements of amended Claim 17. None of the Examiner's reasons for rejection address the aspect of the arrangement of Claim 17 where light reflective portions are arranged randomly. Therefore all elements of the claim are not taught or suggested by the reference cited or by other statements of the Examiner. As such, Claim 17 is allowable. Claims 22 and 23, being dependent on, and further limiting Claim 17 are, without more, allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 17, 22 and 23 have been amended. Claims 17-23 remain pending.

In view of the amendments and for at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,193
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200